

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Previously withdrawn claims 4 to 19 have been canceled. Claims 30 to 37 have been added. Claims 20 to 37 are pending. Claims 20, 21, 24 to 27 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments to the claims and for the new claims can be found throughout the specification. For example, support for the amendments to the claims can be found in the specification, e.g., at page 2, lines 33 to 35, page 3, lines 17 to 22, page 11, line 23 to page 12, line 1, page 17, lines 20 to 22, page 18, lines 5 to 11, page 27, line 33 to page 28, line 7, page 31, lines 1 to 8, and page 37, lines 6 to 9.

Reconsideration of the present application is requested.

II. Information Disclosure Statement

The Office Action asserts that the Information Disclosure Statements (IDS) filed August 31, 2007 and April 3, 2008 do not comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.97(d) because they lack a statement as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.97(e). The IDS filed August 31, 2007 was filed prior to a first office action after the filing of a Request for Continued Examination (RCE), and the IDS filed April 3, 2008 was filed prior to the mailing of a final office action after the filing of the RCE and with payment of the fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(p) as specified by 37 C.F.R. § 1.97(c)(2), so that a statement as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.97(e) was not required with the filing of either of the IDSs. Applicants therefore request consideration of all of the references listed in the IDSs filed August 31, 2007 and April 3, 2008.

III. Rejection of Claims 20 to 29 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1

Claims 20 to 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 as assertedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion. To satisfy the written description requirement, the specification must describe the claimed invention in such sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can reasonably conclude that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. M.P.E.P. § 2163. One skilled in the art would understand the terms “dynamical runtime reconfiguration,” “coarse grained unit,” and “program load unit” as used in the context of the present application.

For example, one skilled in the art would recognize that coarse grained units refer to processing units at a higher than micro level, e.g., higher than the gate level, such as an ALU. For example, in contrast to a coarse grained unit, a unit that can operate at only one bit at a time operates at the gate level.

Nevertheless, to facilitate matters, Applicants have amended the claims to obviate the present rejection.

Withdrawal of this written description rejection of claims 20 to 29 is therefore respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims 20 to 29 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2

Claims 20 to 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 as assertedly indefinite. While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the merits of this rejection, to facilitate matters, Applicants have amended the claims to obviate the present rejection. Withdrawal of this indefiniteness rejection of claims 20 to 29 is therefore respectfully requested.

V. New Claims 30 to 37

New claims 30 to 37 have been added herein. It is respectfully submitted that new claims 30 to 37 do not add any new matter and are fully supported by the present application, including the specification. For example, support for the claims can be found in the specification, e.g., at page 3, lines 34 to 36, page 6, lines 27 to 36, and page 30, line 22 to page 32, line 27.

VI. Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 28, 2008

By: /Michelle Carniaux/
Michelle Carniaux
Reg. No. 36,098

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO 26646